

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 03 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments have been made to clarify aspects in the claims. The amendments are consistent with the disclosure originally filed. The amendments have also been particularly presented to avoid, where applicable, any admission or estoppel, generally, negatively effecting the scope of protection provided by the disclosure and claims of the present application, and particularly to avoid prosecution history estoppel, limitation of the scope of equivalences, or the like. Claims 1-29 are pending in this application and claims 1 and 19 are amended.

35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 concerns

The examiner has expressed concerns to the claims under §102 (b) and cites US Pat. No. 4,604,805 to Krieger (the "Krieger reference"). A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found in a single prior art reference. The identical invention must be shown in complete detail as is contained in the claim. Applicant makes clarifying amendments to the claims to include a non-adjustable blade element. The present application supports such amendment as can be shown in Figs. 1, 2, 4, 5, and the like. In embodiments, the blade element of the present invention is not adjustable within the blade body member unlike the Krieger reference.

The Krieger reference does not disclose a non-adjustable blade element. In fact, to the contrary, Krieger states, "blade is moved forwardly and rearwardly within the recess ... so that projection of the blade beyond the tip may be adjusted." Because the Krieger reference does not teach all the elements or steps of the invention as claimed, independent claims 1 and 19, as well as all of the dependent claims thereof, are not anticipated by the Japan reference. Since claims 1 and 19 are believed to be in condition for allowance, claims 2-18 and 20-29 are also believed to be in condition for allowance in that they each incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claims to which they are dependent. See 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c). Should the office require further explanation, the Applicant stands ready to supplement the above remarks should it be necessary.

Further, concerns under § 103 were raised with respect to only dependent claims. Claims 2-18 and claims 20-29 are ultimately dependent on independent claim 1 or claim 19. Since claims 1 and 19 are believed to be in condition for allowance, claims 2-18 and 20-29 are also believed to be in condition for allowance in that they each incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claims to which they are dependent. See 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c). Should the office require further explanation, the Applicant stands ready to supplement the above remarks should it be necessary.

Importantly, it should be understood that the amendments submitted herein are made as a matter of practicality only, and should not to be construed as creating any situation of file wrapper estoppel or the like as all rights are expressly reserved and may be pursued in this or other applications, such as divisionals, continuations, or continuations-in-part if desired. Amendments are made for tangential issues of clarity and as a matter of the Office's convenience or expedience only. The amendments should not be interpreted as an action that in any way surrenders a particular equivalency, surrenders any right to patent coverage, or otherwise limits any rights that the Applicant may now or hereafter assert. It should be understood that, unless and to the extent deemed broadened by this amendment, and even as amended, the Applicant expressly reserves all rights, including but not limited to: all rights to maintain the scope of literal coverage with respect to any element as may have existed under the language previously presented, all rights to maintain the scope of equivalency coverage as may have existed under the language previously presented, and all rights to re-present the prior language at any time in this or any subsequent application. To the extent currently foreseeable, no change or reduction in *direct or* equivalency coverage is believed to exist, and no change or reduction in *direct or* equivalency coverage is intended through the presentation of this amendment.

The Applicant having addressed each of the action's concerns, respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objections to the

application. Allowance of claims 1-29 is requested at the examiner's earliest convenience.

Dated this 3 day of April, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

SANTANGELO LAW OFFICES, P.C.

By Nicole A. Ressue

Nicole A. Ressue
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 48,665
125 South Howes, Third Floor
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
(970) 224-3100

Hendrickson-DivIII-RCE-text